bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or disposed of until relabeled to conform to the requirements of the Federal food and drugs act and inspected and approved by a representative of this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

16440. Misbranding of cooking compound. U. S. v. 26 Cases of Cooking Compound. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23329. I. S. No. 07410. S. No. 1447.)

On January 14, 1929, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 26 cases of cooking compound, remaining unsold in the original packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Gold Coin Creamery Co., Denver, Colo., January 8, 1929, and transported from the State of Colorado into the State of Illinois, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the cartons containing the said article were labeled as follows: "1 Pound Net Weight Penobscot Nut Product For Best Cooking and Baking Danish Packing Co. Ltd. Providence, R. I. U. S. A. Artificially Colored," which said statements were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser in that the statement "1 Pound Net Weight" represented that each of said cartons contained 1 pound net of the product, whereas each of said cartons contained less than 1 pound net of the said product. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article, being in package form, did not have a statement of the contents plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the carton in terms of weight and measure.

During the March term, 1929, the Danish Packing Co. (Ltd.), claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, the terms of said bond requiring that the product be reconditioned under the supervision of the department so that each carton contain I pound net weight of the article.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

16441. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. 180 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23268. I. S. No. 04735. S. No. 1381.)

On December 21, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 180 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Stamford Cotton Oil Mill, Stamford, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped from Stamford, Tex., on or about November 23, 1928, and transported from the State of Texas into the State of Colorado, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Cottonseed Cake or Meal Prime Quality Crude Protein 43 Per Cent, Rule-Jayton Cotton Oil Co., Manufacturers of Cottonseed Products, General Office, Stamford, Texas."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Protein 43 Per Cent," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser when applied to a product deficient in protein and not

containing 43 per cent of protein.

On March 11, 1929, the Rule-Jayton Cotton Oil Co., Stamford, Tex, claimant having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the ent of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant t relabeled, under the supervision of this department to show the true procontent, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$ conditioned in part that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contito the provisions of the Federal food and drugs act or the laws of the State Colorado.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.